

STACK

X STACK AM

500

8473

A

0000752592



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY





# Austin Addresses

Delivered at the  
University of Texas

January, 1917



By

RABBI MARTIN ZIELONKA

Temple Mt. Sinai

EL PASO, TEXAS

## CONTENTS

---

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| I—Common Ground -----                          | 1    |
| II—Morality Versus Legality-----               | 5    |
| III—Tyranny of The Majority-----               | 8    |
| IV—The Power of Faith-----                     | 11   |
| V—The Place of Religion in a<br>Democracy----- | 14   |

## Common Ground

Whoever emphasizes the particular at the expense of the common, the sectarian instead of the universal, breeds discontent and discourages unity. There may have been a time when progress demanded the literal devotion to a creed but that time has passed.

He who proclaims his faith as the only one that leads to salvation, and sends to perdition all who disagree, is living in the wrong age. When the Constitutional Convention of the United States convened, no single faith was ready to give way to another and none were willing for others to gain an advantage. Brancroft wisely remarks, "American law was the growth of necessity, not the wisdom of individual." And if such were the conditions in those early days, what can we expect today, when faiths are counted by the hundreds, and when each looks to a constitutional guarantee for its right to worship God according to its dictates.

As thinking men and women, we cannot agree upon everything. Life would lose its zest were we to think and act alike. But we can sympathize with each other's views; we can be tolerant. You and I can be the best of friends without knowing to what faith the other swears allegiance, and we can fulfill our duties as citizens of this great republic without parading our religious beliefs.

There is a common platform upon which we can meet as citizens, and which should be the guiding spirit of



your lives as well as mine. You may recall the words of Nathan, the wise, to the friar,

“Indeed! The very thing that makes me seem

Christian to you, makes you a Jew to me.”—(Act iv Sc. 7.)

What is the common ground upon which we can meet?

First and foremost is the belief in God, in a Being not ourselves that tends for righteousness. More and more do we learn that the curse of civilization is the self-made man who worships his Creator. Though we may regulate our destiny, we cannot control it. Heine, in his “History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany” tells us that Kant postulated a deity in his practical system although he had exploded deity in his theoretical system, because his man servant Lampe looked dismally at the conclusions of pure reason, and the philosopher was moved to compassion. The same practical conditions confront every man. It should not matter whether I worship the Supreme Being as Jehovah and you see Him symbolized in Jesus, so long as you do not try to force your teaching on me and I do not try to force my teaching on you. Lip service and confession of faith do not make God real in our lives. It has been well said, “What a man believes may be ascertained not from his creed, but from the assumptions on which he habitually acts.” Now if we act on the assumption of a God, we have common ground for broad fellowship.

And the natural deduction from this first principle of our common ground is the Brotherhood of Man. Not a brotherhood that is limited to the fellowship of a particular church or synagog, but a brotherhood that includes mankind. If God be the Father,

and the Father be One, then all men must be His children. That was an astute remark of an ancient rabbi who declared that the profoundest sentiment of the Bible was found in the fifth chapter of Genesis which declares, "this is the book of the generations of man," because here is used the singular 'man' to designate a common origin of prince and pauper, of nobleman and mendicant.

It matters little whether we quote, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself", from the nineteenth chapter of Leviticus or from the New Testament, so long as we realize the command in our lives.

It matters little whether we quote the golden rule in the positive form of Jesus or adopt the negative form of Hillel, who lived before Jesus, so long as this rule is truly golden in the sunshine and happiness it brings to mankind.

You and I agree that we are something more than flesh and bones, that there rests within each one a spark of the divine Father, which He takes unto Himself in His own time. The difference between man and animal is not only the intellect but also the longing for a realization of life beyond this mundane sphere. And this future life does not depend upon the recital of any particular creed.

You and I may add to these fundamental thoughts whatever our history, our environment or our study may deem best, but we can agree upon foundations. Our additions make us Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Catholics or Jews, but our additions should never be emphasized at the expense of our common ground.

When you and I meet as citizens let us strive for the common good and not for the express benefit of a particular class or creed. Our first object

should be honest and upright citizenship.

A thousand roads may lead to Rome, but an infinite number of roads will lead to our Father in heaven because He is infinite. Thinking men may agree upon a common ground but no two thinking men will agree exactly upon the details of their belief.

When all is said and done do not the words of Nathan, the wise, come back to us,

"I cannot venture to decide between Rings which the Father hath expressly made  
To baffle those who would distinguish them."

Let us then do our best here and now, each working for the benefit of all and none working for the sole benefit of one.



# Morality Versus Legality

Adjustments along social, religious, industrial and business lines are apparent everywhere. The recent threatened tying up of our railways system and with it the paralyzing of all industry; the strikes in the coal fields and garment industries are simply straws which show the way in which the wind is blowing and this wind is not a good omen.

Many reasons are assigned for this condition—general unrest caused by international strife; increased cost of living; ever higher standards of living; decrease of illiteracy; the granting of fundamental rights to laboring men with the result of their demanding ever greater rights.

Such explanations are true in part; they do not reach the fundamental. A tremendous change in industry has taken place within less than a century and this tremendous change has reacted upon mankind. No such change could possibly take place without leaving an indelible impression on men. And this impression has been of a dual nature. The men of power and means felt the strength of their position and refused to relinquish any of their power; the laboring man, realizing a subordinate position, recognized the dignity of labor, the necessity of labor in the economy of the world, and demanded an ever greater but just portion of the results of his labor.

And this tremendous change has brought a change of emphasis in hu-

man affairs. The moral question was at one time a vital question. Right and wrong were uppermost in men's minds. Today this is changed: today the question has become "Am I legally right or legally wrong: am I within the law?"

And this is true of both sides of our dispute. Labor seeks to be within the law in every effort to improve its conditions and if these conditions cannot be changed under existing laws, then the law must be so changed as to give ample protection to labor. Employers want to be within the law and should developing public opinion demand certain laws which might force a readjustment in factory or mine then must such legal enactments be opposed no matter how just or how much they may add to public welfare. It has become a question of Morality versus Legality; it is a conflict of two standards and the lower standard must give way to a higher standard.

The railway brotherhoods may be legally right in refusing to arbitrate their differences and threatening to tie up the industrial life of the nation, but are they morally right?

The factory boss may be legally right in employing immature children in the manufacture of his wares, but is he morally right?

The civilization of the future depends on the boys and girls of today, and if we sap the vitality of these youths how can we expect to rear another generation which shall be physically, morally and mentally strong? The moral rights of the entire future should be greater than the legal rights of the present. "The sins of the fathers are visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." We cannot deny this.

Entrenched behind legal rights each

side continues the struggle: now giving this reason, now giving that excuse. The struggle continues and will continue so long as it is simply a question of legal rights and all moral implications are forgotten.

And what will be the end? I can see but one and I feel certain that history gives but one answer. Laws change with each generation; legal rights are simply temporary rights. Men may struggle against the gradual approach of legal rights to the higher demands of the moral code, but they struggle in vain. The ten commandments, the moral implications of the nineteenth chapter of Leviticus, the flaming words of the prophets have become the heritage of mankind and must sooner or later be reflected in all laws dealing with the relations of men. Today it may be a struggle of "Morality versus Legality"; tomorrow it must be an adjustment of legal enactments to the great moral code underlying our civilization.

For this religious task the college man and woman must gird his loins; it is a struggle worth while, a struggle for the best in men and women; a struggle for the light which must ultimately conquer all darkness.

# Tyranny of The Majority

Wealth and luxury are sapping the vitality of our nation; the cankerous growth of discontent has eaten deeply into our vitals. Salvation is possible only thru a saving remnant.

What is there beneath the discontent seen on all sides of the United States but the sudden growth of wealth due to increased trade; the increase of luxury versus the cry of the poor for a fair share of the added wealth

A cry for greater democracy is sounded in every quarter of the nation. The people as individuals would have more to say about the government and its needed regulations. The magazines and newspapers are filled with articles and editorials upon the initiative, referendum, the recall of judiciary decisions. These are the cures advocated for our disease. Few will deny that these may bring good results if used with proper safeguards. But will they not undermine the basic principles of our government? There is no such thing as absolute freedom and absolute democracy; there is only such freedom and such democracy as is circumscribed by laws enacted for the common weal.

These seek to enforce the power of numbers. They make possible violence by mob and mob rule. We are unconsciously striving to exploit the tyranny of the majority, forgetting the minority and its rights guaranteed by the constitution. The founders of the

nation never intended to establish a direct government but a representative government.

There is nothing we need fear more than the tyranny of the majority. Our country is so large, its inhabitants of such diverse natures, religiously and ethically, that right in one part of the country may be wrong in another part: the will of the majority here may be the will of a weak minority elsewhere.

We have adequate laws to overcome the evil in our midst, but we do not take the time to perform our duty as citizens at the polls. New laws and experimenting with new forms will not make the citizen better and more willing to use his power for good. What we need is not more laws and a more complicated procedure, but newer and higher ideals of citizenship and a more honest enforcement of existing laws.

Let us take a concrete example. A few years ago the supreme court of the State of Illinois in a suit submitted by some catholic parents, decreed that singing of devotional songs, reading of the bible, and reciting the "Lord's prayer" was religious worship and prohibited by the constitution of the state which guaranteed the separation of church and state. Following this decision a howl was heard throughout the State of Illinois. Church conference after church conference passed resolutions denouncing the same; petitions after petitions, decrying the court, were signed and forwarded to the governor. How long do you think would this just decision have remained valid and the rights of the minority, as guaranteed by the constitution respected, if the tyranny of the majority had ruled and numbers instead of right had determined the issue.



What we need today is a saving remnant that shall steer the ship of state away from the Scylla and Carybdis of destruction out into the placid waters of representative government, where all men, having their rights guaranteed, will have these rights respected. What we need today is a saving remnant that shall recognize its duty as citizens, and do its duty as citizens. Then will we be free to rise from strength to strength without fear or favor, giving unto all men their just deserts, nothing more and nothing less.

# The Power of Faith

The pendulum of a clock swings as far in one direction as in the other; human thought gives expression to both extremes in every period of history. The materialism of Hobbs is followed by the mysticism of Locke and the Utilitarian philosophy of Pragmatism runs parallel with mystic Christian Science.

With the increased importance of the manufacturer and the merchant, the philosophy of materialism gained ground; faith was ready to be cast aside. Men judged life and actions not by motives, but by results, not by broad principles, but by temporary facts. The well springs of idealism had dried up and cold-blooded business principles ruled in all matters. Men scoffed at idealism; religion became a mocking; those who sought to realize ideals were laughed at as dreamers. The ledger became the bible of life and utilitarianism the basis of action.

Little wonder then that the tide has turned! Having given materialism a fair trial human thought has turned to the other extreme. Faith and religion are now looked at with more charitable eyes; the minds and hearts of men are more open to truth and a consideration of the deeper problems of life.

We are more than creatures of circumstances. Our actions are governed by more than our intellectual training. We bear the inheritance of generations long passed to the great

beyond and we cannot completely rid ourselves of this influence.

All materialistic philosophy fails before the power of faith in ourselves. "I will" and the victory is half won; "I can't" and failure is evident. The mind finds expression not only in words but also in deeds; not only in my deeds but in the deeds of others. The patient cannot be cured if he does not have faith in his doctor, and many wondrous cures have been performed by a simple solution of sugar and water because men really believed they would be cured. Many men have passed to the great beyond because they had not the willpower to make a final rally. The seeming miracles performed at many places of pilgrimage are facts and easily explained in this way.

I call your attention to this thought with the hope of interesting you in the power of faith. The man who believes in himself will in the end force others to believe in him; the man who has faith and power to exercise it cannot be moved.

This is an exceedingly liberal age. Men are throwing off the shackles of creeds and dogmas and asserting the right to evolve their own solution of the world mystery and, having thought it out, to live it. Yet, with it all, there are thousands upon thousands whose minds have reached definite conclusions concerning their religious ideas, yet, week in and week out, they assemble to repeat a creed whose dicta their brains cannot accept and whose words can be uttered only with a mental reservation. The hand of the past is upon them and faith is more powerful than reason. The attempts to bring about reforms in all our large cities have failed to a great extent because men have inherited a *laissez-faire* spirit and are satisfied so

long as no one interferes with their business. If democracy is a failure, as some claim, then it is due more to the fact that we do not recognize the power of faith, than to any other single reason.

It is well and good to strive for the material ends of life; men deserve commendation who strive to supply their dear ones with more than the necessities, but it is equally necessary that we impress upon our offspring the power of faith—faith in God, faith in our fellowmen, and faith in ourselves. Without these this world is very dreary; without it our life is a wilderness, instead of a garden. We may not be able to fathom the depths of the human soul, the human heart and the human mind, but everywhere about us we can see the influence of our thoughts, our actions and our words. Progress may be measured by standards of wealth, but it should also be measured by standards of character. "A guilty thought is almost as criminal as a guilty deed," should be branded on the minds of the growing generation, for it is fraught with the deepest meaning. He who has pure thoughts will live a pure life and he who allows his thoughts to run riot will lead a life filled with danger.

The phenomena of the mind may cause us fear, they may arouse within us feelings of distrust; the development of those inmate powers that control the actions of others may cause us dread, yet, if we will consider and study, if we will only remember that we are learning more and more about man and God, as year follows year, then will "our faith triumph o'er our fears," make us more charitable to the faults of our neighbors because we have learned our own defects.

# The Place of Religion In A Democracy

Every now and then the country is aroused by an attempt to read God or Jesus into the Constitution of the United States; every now and then the discussion waxes warm as to whether or not this is a "Christian" country. Every call for a state constitutional convention—to give more modern basic principles for state governments—reveals a concerted effort to place the name of God or the Christian Savior into the new constitution, and make bible reading or some form of religious exercises a part of the educational system. The smaller the city or village, the more bitter and acrimonious becomes the debate when the rights of minorities are urged. Because of this continued emphasis on the subject, I deem it wise to discuss "The Place of Religion in a Democracy" in order that I may interpret for you, as a representative of a minority faith, our conception of the place of religion in a democracy and allow you to draw such conclusions as you deem proper about our rights in the matter. In order to do justice to my subject, it will be necessary to outline the causes resulting in the omission of the name of the Christian Savior or the name of God, from our constitution, and, which finally ended with religious liberty guaranteed to all. I do this, not with any idea of presenting new or startling facts, nor even teaching anything that is not well known, but simply to refresh



your memories about facts known to all students of American history.

Let me begin by making the positive statement — full religious liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States was not the result of long, premeditated effort, but rather, of accident. "American law was the growth of necessity, not the wisdom of individuals" says Bancroft. And yet this development through necessity has been characterized by Bryce as "the most salient, of all the differences between the Old World and the New." And Ranke acknowledges that "the whole life and character of western Christendom consists of the constant action and counteraction of Church and State."

Since such good authorities agree as to the value of this experiment in government, let us examine its origin more closely. But let us not attempt to read into the history of the New England settlements some principles which pervade our government. Those Pilgrim leaders need no apology. They followed the light as they saw it. Their differing religious convictions brought the numerous New England states into existence. It is a strange fact, but nevertheless true, that each new New England settlement was organized by exiles, for conscience sake, from one of the older states. These men came over with an intense love for their faith. They were thoroughly imbued with the basic principle of the Augsburg peace—"cujus regio, ejus religio," "the religion of the community is determined by the religion of the prince." Since they could not give assent to the religion of their prince, they sought new lands where they might be the princes designating that religion.

It is therefore not surprising to find President Oakes of Harvard de-

claring in 1673—"I look upon unbounded Toleration as the first-born of all abominations": Of Governor Dudley proclaiming—"God forbid that our love for the truth should be grown so cold that we shall tolerate error": Of Berkeley giving thanks that "there are no free schools nor printing and I hope we shall not have these hundred years, for learning has brought disobedience and heresy and sects in the world." And Blackstone, a congregational minister of Boston, naively pointed out the inconsistency of the Pilgrims when he said that he left England "because he did not like the Lord Bishops"; now he could not remain with the colonists "because he would not be under the Lord Brethren."

Nor would I criticise the harshness of the faith of these earlier settlers; I disagree with them in toto as to their acts. It was a period of intolerance to all who disagreed and full tolerance to all who were in accord. Today we may scan their acts as stepping stones to liberty. In midwinter the Massachusetts colony drove Roger Williams into the primeval forest of Rhode Island, but it gave him an opportunity to found his "lively experiment" and for this we should be thankful. Endicott put the dissenting Brownes upon a ship and returned them to England; non-attendance at church services was punishable with a fine in nearly every colony at some time or another. Baptist preachers were beaten and imprisoned in Virginia and Stuyvesant asked his company that no Jews be permitted "to infest New Netherlands." Strange as these incidents seem to us they were simply the honest results of the religious principles of the day; simply the dark spots gradually revealing the

necessity of turning on the light of freedom.

And enticing as would be a study of the rise of religious toleration, I must pass it over with only a few remarks. Even so great a statesman as Disraeli declared as late as 1868 at the disestablishment of the Irish church that it was "destroying that sacred union between church and state which has hitherto been the chief means of our civilization and is the only safeguard for our religious liberty." Thomas Paine was far more correct in declaring "toleration is not the opposite of intolerance, but is the counterfeit of it. Both are despotisms. The one assumes to itself the right of withholding liberty of conscience; the other of granting it." Toleration is a denial of the very principle underlying the idea of religious liberty and Lord Stanhope, in 1827 epitomized the development of religious liberty in the United States and in every other country when he said "The time was, when toleration was craved by dissenters as a boon; it is now demanded as a right, but the time will come when it will be spurned as an insult."

Toleration gradually took the place of open opposition. At least it became more apparent each year that dissension could not be downed by oppression and legal enactments were no guarantee for purity of religious belief. Although the laws remained on the statute books, they were not enforced. Massachusetts, for instance, tolerated Episcopalians and Baptists; and New York and Virginia tolerated the Presbyterians.

A general condition of toleration prevailed at the breaking out of the American revolution. Roger Williams continued firm in "his lively experiment;" Madison had opposed the Virginia Bill of Rights of 1776

because of "the dangerous implication in the word toleration" and Jefferson had boldly declared "it is error alone that needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself."

At the time the Union was formed—only two out of the thirteen states conceded full and perfect freedom by law—namely, Rhode Island and Virginia. Protestantism was insisted on by six—New Hampshire, Connecticut, New Jersey, the two Carolinas and Georgia: the Christian religion was demanded by two—Delaware and Maryland. Assent to the divine inspiration of the Bible was required by four—Pennsylvania, Delaware and the two Carolinas. Belief in heaven and hell was asked by two—Pennsylvania and South Carolina: three states excluded clergymen from public office—New York, Maryland and South Carolina; two states emphasized belief in One God—Pennsylvania and South Carolina; while assent to the doctrine of the trinity was necessary in Delaware; and in five states—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland and South Carolina there were religious establishments.

Delegates from states with such divergent views on religious matters, met to form articles of confederation and jointly to meet a common foe. Is it any wonder that religious questions were almost taboo and that congress in 1774, seeking to induce Quebec to join in opposition, should declare—"all old religious jealousies are condemned as low minded infirmities?" At the dawn of the revolution the colonies were ready for a "religious liberty untrammelled by the civil law, in which the terms conformity and dissent would become forever inapplicable." And thus in spite of the fact that Major Lusk of Massachusetts

"shuddered at the idea that Roman Catholics, Baptists and Pagans might be introduced into office and that popery and the Inquisition might be established in America" they adopted as part of their constitution—"no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States (VI-3), and the first amendment explicitly states—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Yet with these constitutional guarantees, and the lesson which history brings about the tolerations and persecutions of the early period of our government, we must not forget that the federal constitution applies only to the federal sphere. There is no force of law against a religious establishment in any state, should such a state, in adopting a new constitution, write therein an established church. The government cannot prevent such things. We may honestly believe that public opinion, within the state or within the sister states would not tolerate such action, yet we must not be blind to such possibilities. We need only recall the present anti-Catholic movement, sowing seeds of religious bigotry. What fruit this will bear no one can foretell. We may weigh well the words of Bryce—"Half of the wars of Europe, half the internal troubles that have vexed the European States—have arisen from theological differences or from rival claims of church and state."

And within the state and, the smaller units of the state, the city, the attack on the present status has been from two opposing sides—one party declares that the separation of church and state is not as complete as it should be. To uphold their ar-



guments they refer to the exemption of church property from taxes; to laws for protection of a day of rest; to the anti-Mormon legislation; to the engagement of chaplains for our army and navy; to the use of chaplains in our national and state legislatures; and to the proclamation of an annual Thanksgiving day. These arguments seem, at first hand, to be convincing, but I feel sure that they simply reveal one deep human fact, namely, that a complete separation of religion from life is impossible: that religion and life are co-extensive and our only safeguard is the guaranteeing of equal religious opportunities to all American citizens.

The claim of others is that our attitude is unchristian, and no true Christian ought to countenance this separation from the affairs of state of all that is so vital in his religion. Whether or not this is a Christian nation appears to me not even a debatable question if we will draw the distinction, which ought ever to be drawn, whether it is Christian "de jure" or "de facto."

And we must admit that such an argument is extremely superficial. Is the religious quality of a people determined by the phrases it places on its law books or by the spirit of its life? Is New Hampshire more Protestant or Christian with such terms in its constitution than is Massachusetts without them? Or is Michigan less religious than New York because it excludes the names of deity from its fundamental law while New York is 'grateful to Almighty God?' "

And we have the authority of a treaty with Tripoli concluded by Washington and ratified by the senate under John Adams (June 7, 1797) which says—"As the government of the United States is not in any sense

founded on the Christian religion: as it has itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Musselmen—it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of harmony existing between the two countries.”

But some ask—“Is not the confession of Christ more Christian than silence?” Such a question simply confounds personal duties with national duties, and with those who will not draw a distinction we cannot argue. Throughout all our discussion about the early conditions of this country and the struggle for religious liberty, there is a “strong undercurrent of the need of religion for human welfare” or as the Bill of Rights of Massachusetts properly puts it “the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government depend on piety, religion and morality.” And even a superficial study of history reveals the fact that “irreligion is the sure precursor of social decay and ruin.”

What then is the place of religion in a democracy like ours? In the first place we must stand for religious freedom for every faith, no matter how great or how small, so long as the morality of the faith is not subversive of the standard of morality as accepted in our day. This does not mean that irreligion is placed in power; it does not mean that any religion with a limiting adjective is placed in control, but it does mean that Religion with a capital “R” has full sway and its sway is limited only by an honest regard for the faith of others. “The state has no call to make men religious or moral, but its highest duty is to take care that society shall not be disintegrated by irreligion and immorality.”

There is need of Religion in a democracy. I firmly believe it has a more definite message and a more definite place in our form of government than in any other. Where the faith of the ruler is the faith of the land, tradition builds its walls of exclusion and inclusion. Though persecution may result here and there, religion has a definite place in the economy of life. But our democracy recognizes no particular faith and its origin justifies a refusal to establish a state church or a national church. Here the rights of the minority must be safeguarded against the possible tyranny of the majority, here religion, while having no stated position, can wield an even greater influence.

In the first place it can create a relation of mutual respect between church and state. It can develop that finer sense of manhood which recognizes the dignity and rights of the individual soul and, recognizing the same, seeks to fulfill the soul message in the affairs of state.

In the second place, religion, being strictly a personal matter, can so wield and weld the individual that he will carry the ideals of his faith into the arena of daily life. This is the peculiar possibility of religion in a democracy because the influence of the church, as a church, is obliterated and substituted for this is the individual as a religious being. When grave national problems present themselves, ethical values and implications are weighed, and then each individual, according to his light, and different individuals according to their differing lights, may consider the same from all angles and in common council, after due deliberation, decide upon a just course.

As valuable as these differing re-

ligious standards are to a nation, just so great is the conservative influence of religion. It is said that religion is extremely conservative, that the forms and customs of the past are its sole guides. There is much truth in this. The truth therein makes it valuable to democracy. Democracies are easily obsessed by the value of majorities, follow every new thought and every new idea presented in a convincing form, and are thus more easily led by demagogism. Here religion with its conservatism is of great value. It teaches the value of experience; it proclaims the soundness of doctrine or dogma hallowed by age; it speaks with respect about the fundamentals laid down by the founders of the nation. And this habit of thought must not be underestimated. It is not my idea to proclaim to you the supreme value of the past and the lack of all values in modern thought, but it is my aim to re-emphasize the need of sympathetically considering the past.

And if I may add to these reasons, one other I would say—it makes possible the living together, working together and dieing together of all men, no matter what their personal attitude toward the world's mystery may be, because they are united by love for a common fatherland and by a devotion to a common flag. Other lands may have their privileged and their tolerated; we have but one class—that of the free. Other lands may imbue with a patriotism limited by the rights of the individual; this land can inspire only an unlimited patriotism for it recognizes no special rights, gives no special privileges and tolerates no separate views of citizenship but gives to each and every one the same rights, the same privileges and liberty instead of toleration.

Experience has proven the value of

this "lively experiment" of Roger Williams, tried on a national basis. While here and there men may seek to ignore the teaching and the experience of the past, the college men and women, thoroughly honest and consistent in their personal religious life, can guarantee the future by proclaiming in times of danger those lessons of the past which are the only safeguard of ages yet unborn.

Story is right when he tells us—"The Catholic and the Protestant, the Calvinist and the Armenian, the Jew and the Infidel may sit down at a common table of the national councils without Inquisition into their faith and mode of worship," and it is for the college man and woman to work for the continued realization of what Thomas F. Bayard, while secretary of state, said—"Religious liberty is the chief corner stone of the American system of government and provisions for its security are embodied in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of our laws." When Religion and religions recognize this fact, they will wield a far greater influence than would the placing of the name of deity in our constitution or the introduction of prayer and religious songs into our public schools.





UNIV. OF CALIF. LIBRARY, LOS A

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**A** 000 075 259 2

